DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 328 113 HE 024 136

AUTHOR Hawthorne, Elizabeth M.; Ninke, Diane
TITLE Focus on Faculty Service.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 19p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Cooperative Programs; Faculty Development; Higher Education; National Surveys; *Postsecondary Education as a Field of Study; Professional Development; *School Community Programs; *School Community Relationship; *Two Year Colleges; *Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Faculty Service

ABSTRACT

A 1988-89 national survey examined faculty community service by asking 142 faculty members specializing in higher education, community college education, or adult education two questions: what kinds of service the faculty members provide to two-year colleges and why they engage in these activities. Service was defined as anything a university/program/center does for the good of the community rather than for the benefit of the institution/program. Among results were the following: 65% of respondents have on-going relationships with community colleges in areas such as curriculum development projects and organizational change activities; 44% of respondents indicated they have been involved in developing professional education programs for community and technical colleges; 76% reported they have informal contacts with two-year colleges; and only 28% reported that faculty members are rewarded for service activities. Service was provided mainly in professional development opportunities for community college administrators and faculty members. The considerable informal contact did not necessarily translate into substantial service. Survey responses suggested, however, that service can and does benefit both the service providers and recipients. Includes 25 references. (LPT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED328113

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Elizabeth Hawthorne

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FOCUS ON FACULTY SERVICE

by

Elizabeth M. Hawthorne, Ph.D. and Diane Ninke
The University of Toledo

Service is one component of a university's mission and has sturdy roots in American collegiate history. Indeed, as will become evident, the concept of the collegiate institution was from the beginning an educational and a service endeavor, although the concept of service evolved over time. In the colonial college the heart of service was providing educated men for ministry and public service by transmitting the sum total of human knowledge (as they knew it to be) to the young men enrolled in the colleges. College educations were, then, well woven into the fabric of society so that any good done by the college to its students and probably to its faculty members was inherently seen to be a service to society.

It was well understood by the founding fathers of the colonial colleges that higher education was a necessary ingredient for a developing democratic society (Cremin, 1970); that is, education was itself a service to society. One can observe the deep importance of education in those early moments of our republic in George Washington's efforts to establish a national university. In an address to Congress in 1796, Washington observed that "...a flourishing state of

HE024136

the arts and sciences contributes to national prosperity and reputation (p. 102)." He continued to note that by bringing youths from all over the country to this university, "the greater will be our prospect of permanent union (p. 102)." However the concept of university service metamorphosed into a more sophisticated view of the direct responsibility that the university or college has to contribute to the social good.

Two movements converged to stimulate higher education service activities. One was the entrance of governmental interest in higher education exemplified by the formation of state universities prior to the Civil War and the congressional enactment of the Morrill Act in 1862 initiating the founding of public institutions to train artisans and farmers, which would be a service to the industrial classes and to the economic development of the states. During the same time period, colleges and then universities began to view themselves as potential and then actual developers of knowledge, knowledge that often had direct applications in the community; this was a change from the view of colleges as simply disseminators of information.

A case in point is the beginning of Michigan Agricultural College. Originally conceived in 1850 and opened in 1857 with sixty-three students, the College later established a program of research in agricultural sciences in 1863, adumbrating the research function of the "American Research University." The new information developed became a commodity to share--an opportunity to

serve, which formed the basis for its future extension service--the need to disseminate the new ideas "discovered through controlled research (Blair and Kuhn, 1955)." The Extension Service, established by the Hatch Act of 1887, can most certainly be assigned the honor as the first formal service activity of universities to their communities. Indeed, Johnson (1981) attributed the stabilization and full acceptance of the land grant colleges to their research and dissemination through the extension service work.

About the same time, Daniel Coit Gilman became the president of Johns Hopkins University, where public lectures were offered in its first year and a local extension service was developed shortly after (Portman, 1978). In 1891 New York passed the University Extension Act which funded programs to serve the communities through information bureaus, libraries, publications, and equipment (Portman, 1978). Harvard expanded to include an active research function, and other research universities were founded, funded, and flung into the mainstream of social activity in the United States (Brubacher and Rudy, 1976; Rudolph, 1962; and others).

The notion of university service to society is embodied in the "Wisconsin Idea" articulated by Charles Van Hise at the turn of the century (Hoeveler, 1976; Brubacher and Rudy, 1976). Because the community served by the University of Wisconsin was mainly made up of farmers, and many of them shifted from grain raising to raising cattle, they were in need of technical assistance in the new

enterprise. The University of Wisconsin saw itself as the source for that assistance and vigorously aided the farmers in accommodating to the changes in the Wisconsin farming industry. The acceptance of this activity was due in large part to the citizens of Wisconsin, who, having come from New England, Germany, and Scandinavia where education was valued and educational expertise viewed as a resource, welcomed the university's contributions (Brubacher and Rudy, 1976).

The Wisconsin Idea lends a strong public flavor to service outside the institution to the citizenry--the responsibility of a tax-supported institution is to serve the taxpayers. It can be argued today that service is a mission of higher education both public and private in varying degrees and is perceived by many to be as inherent to a college or university as is teaching and research (see Bok, 1982; Giametti, 1988). Federal support for community service activities was realized under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, which supported seminars, workshops, and training programs. Recently, at an American Council of Education meeting, Derek Bok, President of Harvard University, cited John F. Kennedy's inaugural address: "There is a lot more that we can do for this country." (Bok put forth a commendable agenda for service by institutions of higher education that is worthy, but outside the purview of this article (Jaschik, 1989)).

Service responsibilities can be observed today in the school/college collaborations that are blossoming throughout this country (Zusman, 1989; Hawthorne, 1989; Hawthorne and Zusman, 1990) and in the close working relationships with business and industry such as the customized and contract training done by community colleges (Deegan and Drisko, 1985).

This concept of service is based on the specialized knowledge acquired by the colleges and universities through a variety of activities that can be categorized as basic and applied research and the development of expertise by faculty members in the collegiate institutions, expertise that is pertinent to individuals and groups outside the colleges and universities. Also, service is common to all types of non-profit postsecondary education institutions, e.g., community colleges, private liberal arts colleges, public universities, and private universities.

Various scholars have identified different elements of service activities. Harper and Davidson (1981) suggested the following types: dissemination of knowledge beyond the campus, delivery of instructional programs beyond the campus, using applied research for immediate application by the public, sharing of resources, and the development of public policy issues and alternatives. Henderson and Henderson (1975, 112) expand these ideas by including pure and applied research along with "extension services and continuing education, community services, consulting services, reference bureaus, and cultural events."

We are now anticipating the conclusion of a century characterized by dramatic changes in the types of postsecondary education institutions. The beginning of public community and technical colleges and the increasingly diverse populations attending or seeking access to college (especially the greater proportions of women and minorities) affected the character of higher education. Further, new technologies that drive the development of new curricula and the modification or termination of old curricula and phenomenal increases in research expenditures and productivity have forced us to reconsider the uses and purposes of postsecondary education. We have also witnessed the evolution of the service function that can include technology transfer, proprietary research, debates over applied vs. basic research, continuing education, retraining and skills modification for workers displaced from their jobs, and the continuing dissemination of research findings (See Bird and Allen, 1989).

The definition of service in the literature is motley, suggesting the lack of scholarly attention to this subject and the exploratory nature of such research. Florestano and Hambrick (1984) focus on the benefits to the recipients of university service, i.e., government, citizens, and organizations. McMillan (1984) viewed service as service to local beneficiaries. Checkoway's (1989) definition is consistent with the historic interpretation of service, that is, as "work that develops knowledge for the welfare of society (p. 10)." Martin (1977) stated that "teaching and research have always been and remain today a form of service (p.

14)," also reflective of the historical viewpoint. Boyer and Lewis (1984) include consulting as a form of public service, although we exclude that from our definition since consulting provides direct rewards to the consulting academic. However, we do not view this as an unimportant aspect of fulfilling a university's obligations to society. Others have offered additional definitions (e.g., see Elman and Smock, 1985, Long in Harper and Davidson, 1981).
On the other side, service, as might be expected, is not the source of reward within a university. In general, it is not one of the guiding criteria used for promotion or for tenure. Florestano and Hambrick (1984) listed three reasons: First, service is hard to define and there are no standards to use to differentiate between service that is professionally-related and service that is not professionally-related. Second, there are no good measures to evaluate service. Third, in general, faculty members and administrators themselves do not regard service highly. Podenski and Mangieri (1987) agree, adding that some educators do not believe that service is a "legitimate university function," there is little equality of service among institutions or within institutions, and there is an increasing conflict between service and entrepreneurship.

For the purposes of this study, service was defined as anything a university/program/center does that is for the good of the "community," however "community" is defined. The service is performed for the extrinsic value of the service alone rather than for the benefit of the

university/program/center. We are focusing here on faculty service to the community, in contrast to university/industry research ventures, extension services, and other institutionally structured service programs, although some of the faculty service can fit into these.

In this context we surveyed faculty members in higher education/community college/adult education programs who were listed in the 1987 Association for the Study of Higher Education Membership Director and who were included in the Council of Universities and Colleges mailing list. Sixty-seven percent of the 213 faculty members who were queried responded to the survey (N = 142). The survey was conducted during the 1988-1989 academic year. We sought answers to the following questions: "What kinds of service do they provide to two-year colleges?" "Why did they engage in these activities?" "What benefits were derived from these activities by the program and by the community college?" Finally, we were interested in how important service is to their institutions. The intent of this research is to stimulate a discussion about how we can serve and what we can do in our service endeavors.

FINDINGS

All sections of the country were included, although there were not respondents from every state, in part, because there are some states that do not have higher education programs. There did not appear to be any significant response bias.

Sixty-five percent of the respondents have on-going relationships with community colleges in areas such as curriculum development projects and organizational change activities in two-year colleges. Furthermore, respondents reported the presence of community college professionals on the faculty of the program/department, joint research projects, internships for students in two-year colleges, and advisory committees to the higher education program.

Forty-four percent of the respondents indicated that they have been involved in developing professional education programs for community and technical colleges and seventy-six percent of the respondents reported that they have informal contacts with two-year colleges, most of them suggesting that these contacts were frequent throughout an academic year. Contacts with faculty members were similar in frequency to those of administrators, who were generally reported to be presidents, vice presidents, and deans.

In general, the ways in which these programs assisted two-year colleges can be categorized as professional development activities, e.g., lectures, in-service programs, and faculty development programs; cooperative ventures, e.g., sharing of facilities and equipment and joint seeking of external support; creation of information, e.g., conducting evaluations and applied research for the community college; and programmatic involvement, e.g., working with model or demonstration programs at the two-year college. Professional development

programs and joint seeking of external funding were the most frequently mentioned service activities.

A small proportion of the faculty members indicated that they had prepared materials for use by two-year colleges, e.g., computer software (9 percent), videotapes (15%), audiocassettes (6 percent), transparencies (29%), and case studies (25 percent).

Respondents related that they conducted research activities with and for two-year colleges including needs assessments, attitude surveys of students, and strategies to improve teaching and learning. Research was also conducted on administrator performance, minorities, long-range institutional planning, and leadership.

Graduate courses about two-year colleges can be divided into four general categories: administration and history, curriculum, teaching, and on-site learning experiences (including internships and supervised teaching). Introductory or survey courses on community colleges are prevalent. In addition to the four categories identified above, a variety of additional subject matter pertinent to two-year colleges is covered in coursework.

The benefits of service appear to be consistent with the reported objectives of providing the service. Most respondents identified the following benefits to their programs resulting from the service they offer to community and technical colleges: the service helps to attract new students to the program, it keeps the

program current, and it brings new ideas to the program. Furthermore, the involvement of faculty members with the two-year colleges assures that faculty members are knowledgeable about issues of importance to the two-year colleges. Most faculty members at the universities saw personal financial rewards as a benefit of service and many regarded financial benefits to their programs as positive outcomes of their contributions to two-year colleges. Finally, the service activities, by keeping university faculty members in contact with administrators and faculty members at the two-year colleges, fostered collegiality and a sense of shared purpose.

Many faculty members indicated that they had no regular contacts with community and technical college personnel. The main reasons specified were that faculty members had other obligations (33 percent), lacked adequate funding (27 percent), were either not knowledgeable about or not interested in two-year colleges (25 percent), or that two-year colleges had rejected overtures from the university for service opportunities (14 percent).

Fifteen percent indicated that their university policies prevented regular contacts. While no one indicated specific policies, one may surmise that the lack of reward for such service quelled the ardor of faculty members to provide it. Related to this was the way in which the higher education/community college programs and faculty members disseminated information about the services they were prepared to extend. Overwhelmingly, the communication was informal,

generally through networking and through students in the program, who one assumed to be affiliated with two-year institutions. Twenty-seven percent indicated that they had used newsletters for such purposes.

Only twenty-eight percent of those completing the instrument reported that faculty members are rewarded for service activities with honors presented in public ceremonies or given plaques; and twenty-four percent of the respondents indicated that there were financial awards recognizing service contributions. Other ways in which some faculty members were recognized for service activities were through release time by their departments, honoraria for conducting workshops for external groups by the university, and informal recognition and commendation.

Nevertheless, based on the responses to this survey, one can conclude that service can and does benefit the providers of service, as well as, presumably, the recipients.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Service could potentially rise in its value as part of the faculty role. Higher education programs are not, in general, actively serving community, junior, and technical colleges. The area in which they provide service is in professional development opportunities for community college administrators and faculty members. Work with two-year colleges was seen as beneficial to the

programs, the faculty members, and the students. While there was a considerable amount of informal contact reported between higher education faculty members and community college administrators and faculty members, that informal contact did not necessarily translate into anything substantive.

Teaching and learning materials for classrooms and in-service experiences have not been developed by many respondents to our study. As a result of these findings, the following recommendations are offered:

1. A study should be conducted that will assess the needs of two-year colleges that can be served by higher education/community college programs, e.g., preparing college mission statements, program assessment, and alumni surveys. Similarly, what capabilities do the universities have that are of value to two-year colleges?

2. With the increasing need for new faculty members and administrators in two-year colleges, higher education programs should work together with their area community colleges to recruit, orient, and develop new staff.

3. The potential exists and should be explored for the collaborative development of materials for teaching and learning between two-year and university faculty members.

4. Since only 37 percent of the respondents indicated that they have conducted research for community colleges, this is an area that has the potential to be expanded. What kinds of research projects might professors of community

college education conduct that will address the needs of these institutions, while still helping us to fulfill our obligations as professors?

5. The Council of Universities and Colleges (CUC) as the association of university faculty members who specialize in two-year colleges at universities throughout the United States and Canada can play an active role to stimulate service to community, junior and technical colleges by keeping members apprised of innovations in collaborative relationships between two-year institutions and higher education/community college programs through its newsletter and its annual meeting. CUC should recognize exemplary service activities by faculty members and programs in higher education and create a forum for the exchange of information among universities, between universities and two-year colleges, and among two-year colleges, e.g., a computer network, a new publication, an annual seminar, and/or inviting community college faculty members and administrators to meet with CUC at its annual meeting. CUC should stimulate research on and with community colleges by providing seed money awarded on a competitive basis for such projects. CUC could also initiate a discussion on how we can provide service while still actively engaged in "rewardable" professorial work such as research and teaching.

References

Bird, Barbara J. and David N. Allen. "Faculty Entrepreneurship in Research University Environments." Journal of Higher Education. 60:5. September/October, 1989, 583-596.

Blair, Lyle and Madison Kuhn. A Short History of Michigan State. East Lansing: Michigan State College Press, 1955.

Bok, Derek. Beyond the Ivory Tower. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Boyer, Carol M. and Darrell R. Lewis. "Faculty Consulting: Responsibility or Promiscuity?" Journal of Higher Education. 55:5. September/October 1984, 637-659.

Brubacher, John S. and Willis Rudy. Higher Education in Transition. New York: Harper and Row, Inc., 1976.

Checkoway, Barry N. "Report Examines 'Service' in Research University." The University Record. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, February 6, 1989, 10-12.

Cremin, Lawrence. American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783. New York: Harper and Row, Inc., 1970.

Deegan, William and Ronald Drisko. "Contract Training. Progress and Policy Issues." AACJC Journal. March, 1985, 14-17.

Elman, Sandra E. and Sue Marx Smock. "Professional Service and Faculty Rewards: Toward an Integrated Structure." Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 1985.

Florestano, Patricia S. and Ralph Hambrick. "Rewarding Faculty Members for Profession-Related Public Service." Educational Record. 65:1. Winter 1984, 18-21.

Giametti, A. Bartlett. A Free and Ordered Space. The Real World of the University. New York: W.W. Norton, 1988.

Harper, Charles L. and Carol Davidson. "Faculty Public Service." Mobius. 1:3. July 1981, 5-11.

Hawthorne, Elizabeth M. "Crossing the Boundaries. State Interest in School/College Collaboration." Unpublished manuscript, 1989.

Hawthorne, Elizabeth M. and Ami Zusman. "The Role of State Departments of Education in School/College Collaboration." Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education Annual Meeting, Portland, Oregon, November 1990.

Henderson, Algo D. and Jean Glidden Henderson. Higher Education in America: Problems, Priorities, and Prospects. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Hoeveler, J. David Jr. "The University and the Social Gospel: The Intellectual Origins of the 'Wisconsin Idea'." Wisconsin Magazine of History. Summer 1976, 282-298.

Jaschik, Scott. "Priorities of Most Colleges Are 'Determined Too Much by Financial Expediency,' Harvard President Charges." Chronicle of Higher Education. January 25, 1989, A2.

Johnson, Eldon L. "Misconceptions About the Early Land-Grant Colleges." Journal of Higher Education. 52:4. July/August 1981, 333-352.

Martin, Warren Bryan. "Service Through Ideas of Value: Redefining Service, Research, and Teaching." New Directions for Higher Education. 18. Summer 1977, 1-16.

McMillan, Marcia Ohle. "University Outreach Clinician Training Model." Language, Speech, and Hearing in Schools. 15:4, October 1984, 295-298.

Podenski, Richard S. and John N. Mangieri. "Professional Service - A Skewed Reward." Educational Horizons. 65:2. Winter 1987, 67-70.

Portman, David N. The Universities and the Public: a History of Higher Adult Education in the United States. Chicago: Nelson Hall, 1978.

Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.

Washington, George. Address to Congress, 1796. In Knight, Edgar W. and Clifton L. Hall. Readings in American Educational History. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951, 102.

Zusman, Ami. "System Interest in School/College Collaboration." Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education Annual Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia, November 1989.